Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes Figs. 7a and 7b.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims

Claim 1 has been amended for clarity. Amended claim 1 recites a first bus, a second bus and a fault mode control.

Claim 2 has been amended to add minor changes.

Claim 3 has been amended for clarity. Amended claim 3 recites a plurality of signal resources dividable into at least a first resource subset and a second resource subset and a plurality of buses.

Claims 4-11 has been amended to directly or indirectly depend on claim 1 by replacing "method" with -port--.

Claim 4 has been amended to depend on claim 1.

Claim 6 has been amended for clarity.

Claim 9 has been amended to depend on claim 1.

New claims 12 and 13 have been added. New claim 12 recites a plurality of endpoints, each having the port of claim 1. New claim 13 is a method claim corresponding to claim 1.

The amendments made to the claims are fully supported by the application as originally filed. In particular, support for the amendments made to claims 1 and 3 and new claim 13 can be found, for example, in the description at page 8, the last paragraph to page 11, line 2 and Figures 7-9; support for new claim 12 can be found, for example, in the description at pages 11-12 and Figure 10. No new matter has been introduced by way of the amendments made to the claims.

Drawings

Applicant has amended the sheet of drawings, which was labeled as Figure 7, to mark the top figure and the bottom figure as Figure 7a and Figure 7b, respectively. No new matter has been introduced by way of the amendment made to the drawings.

Specification

Under Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the specification under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

The specification at page 6 has been amended to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Under Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the original title of the invention is not descriptive.

Applicant has amended the title to read "<u>A METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR PROVIDING</u> FAULT TOLERANCE <u>IN A NETWORK</u>"

No new matter has been introduced by way of the amendment made to the specification.

Claim Objection

Under Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 9-11 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form.

Claims 9-11 has been amended to directly or indirectly depend on claim 1.

Under Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 3, concerning some informality.

Claim 3 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections 35 USC\$112

Under Section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 4-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, concerning the term "the switching fabric" in claim 4.

ł

Claim 4 has been amended to depend on claim 1. The term "switching fabric" has been introduced in claim 1. Thus, "the switching fabric" in claim 4 has proper antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections.

Claim Rejections 35 USC \$102

Under Section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Akyol et al. (US Publication No. 2002/0191547). Under Section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gronke (US Publication No. 2002/0071386A1).

Independent claims 1 and 3 have been amended for clarity.

Akyol et al. discloses a system having a plurality of control cards 401, 402, 405 (Figure 4 of Akyol et al.). The card 405 is a redundant card acting as a backup for either or both of cards 401 and 403 (Paragraph [0053] and Figure 4 of Akyol et al.).

Gronke discloses a node 1 containing a local port P₁ and a local port P_N that are connectable to a fabric A and a fabric B, respectively (Paragraphs [0040]-[0041] and Figure 6 of Gronke)

However, none of the cited references taken alone or in combination thereof suggests or teaches a first bus having a first bus section connected to the first resource subset and a second bus section connected to the second resource subset, a second bus connected to the second bus section, and a fault mode control operably coupled to the first bus and the second bus for selectively configuring the port as at least one of a first interface, a second interface and a third interface, as recited in amended claim 1.

None of the cited references taken alone or in combination thereof suggests or teaches configuring the port as a second interface incorporating the second resource subset, including switching one or more operational connections between the plurality of buses and the plurality of signal resources, as recited in amended claim 3.

Hence it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 and 4-11 and claim 3 are new and patentable in view of the cited reference. In addition, claim 12 refers

to the port of claim 1, and claim 13 is a method claim corresponding to claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12 and 13 are new and patentable in view of the cited reference.

Claim Rejections 35 USC \$103

Under Section 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gronke.

Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to depend on claim 1. As discussed, Gronke fails to suggest or teach the subject matter defined by claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

In view of the above amendments and arguments reconsideration and consequent allowance of claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dallas F. Smith

Registration No. 34,074

c/o GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP 160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600 Ottawa, Ontario K1P 1C3 CANADA

Telephone:

(613) 783-8827

Facsimile:

(613) 788-3601